DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 052 918 RE 003 814

TITLE Title I [Remedial Reading Program] Evaluation, 1969-70.
INSTITUTION School City of Mishawaka, Ind.
PUB DATE 71
NOTE 60p.

EDRS PRICE EDRS Price MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS Case Studies, *Educationally Disadvantaged, Elementary Grades, Emotionally Disturbed Children, Individualized Reading, *Institutionalized (Persons), Perceptual Motor Coordination, *Preschool Education, *Program Evaluation, Reading Difficulty, Reading Improvement, Remedial Instruction, *Remedial Reading Programs, Retarded Children

ABSTRACT

An evaluation of the 1969-70 ESEA/Title I programs in the Mishawaka, Indiana school system is presented. Three separate programs are described. (1) A remedial reading program was designed to begin at a level on which the child could read easily and subsequently progress to higher levels. This program involved 391 students in grades 2 through 6. Gates-MacGinitie Reading Test scores showed that the children made considerable gains in reading. (2) A preschool adjustment program consisted of a well-balanced series of educational activities geared to the normal growth and needs of 134 4- to 5-year-old children. A program evaluation, based on comparative observations by kindergarten teachers and principals of the schools, showed that participants in the preschool program were socially and academically superior to nonparticipants in their schools. (3) A varied remedial instruction program for institutionalized children included raising the academic level of the institutionalized child as well as encouraging the adjustment of the emotionally disturbed child within a regular school system. An evaluation, based on individual case studies, showed that the 19 children made a great deal of academic and personal progress. The Gates-MacGinitie test results and various distribution charts are included. (AI)

ED052918

TITLE I EVALUATION

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

SCHOOL CITY OF MISHAWAKA

1969-70

EXCELLENT EVALUATION OF AN

EFFECTIVE REMEDIAL READING PROJECT

RE003 814

COUNTY CODE
71

PROJECT NUMBER
70-248

ED052918

ESEA TITLE I ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT

1969-1970

NAME OF SCHOOL CORPORATION School City of Mishawaka COUNTY St. Joseph

ADDRESS 222 Miami Terrace, Mishawaka, Indiana 46544

CONTACT PERSON Richard Brainerd, Adm. Assistant PHONE 219-259-3763

CONTENTS

Remedial Reading Program . . . . . Blue

Remedial Reading Data . . . . . White

Pre-school Adjustment Program . . . . . Pink

Varied Remedial Instruction for Institutionalized Children . . Green

ESEA TITLE I ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT

Name of Project Remedial Reading

Total Cost of Project $51,134.16 Number of Participants 391

Date Started 9-2-69 Date Ended 6-5-70 Will it be Continued Yes x No

I. What type and age of children are participating in the project? Indicate grade levels, public and/or non-public, dropouts, and preschoolers when appropriate.

The children who participate in the Remedial Reading program are those who are experiencing academic failure. Many of them have limited experience backgrounds for reading. They are often discouraged and unmotivated to learn. Their self concept is frequently negative until they begin to experience success in learning to read. Many of them seem to have adopted the idea that they cannot learn, so why try. When the purpose of the program is explained, they seem pleased that a special program has been designed for them because of their potential and importance in the scheme of things. Children from grades 2-6 in both public and private schools are included in the program.

II. Describe the projects. Give a brief narrative description highlighting their unique or outstanding features.

The program is designed to begin at whatever level the child can read easily, and progress through higher levels. Materials are selected for use that are unlike those used in previous learning experiences in order that children will have a feeling of a "fresh" start. Students from the primary grades are given first consideration in the program in order that they can avoid the emotional "dead end" that seems to come through a succession of failures. Although a multi-media approach is used, we have found the Sullivan Reading Program most effective with young children. The repetition of new words and the individual procedures it follows seem to promote confidence and feelings of security in children having difficulty learning to read.

III. What is the total number of children who are involved in your Title I program? Count a child only once regardless of how many programs he participates in.

Public school students who participated in the program from four target schools numbered 341. Private school students numbered 50, for a total of 391 students.

IV. (a) Have you used any state funds to augment your Title I program? If so, describe the programs involved giving data such as: objectives, number of participants, and level of funding.

Local and state funds have been used to support the program when needed.

Blue

(b) Have you coordinated your Title I program with other federally funded programs?

Books and audiovisual materials that would motivate, stimulate, and fill-in the limited background of students in Title I have been included among those purchased under Title II and III.

(c) What were these programs and what agencies were involved?

Our experiences with primary children in the reading program indicate that much can be done at an earlier level to equate differences in the background of children and promote readiness for learning. The nursery school was organized to meet this need.

Counseling and educational services have been extended to the children who reside at the Family and Children's Center. One Remedial Reading teacher works at the center on a daily basis.

V. What effect has the Title I program had on the administrative structure of educational practice in your school system?

The Title I program has been indirectly responsible for the nursery school program. It is hoped that an early discovery of the child's problem will eliminate some of the difficulties in the initial stages of learning to read. The guidance services of the schools have developed special counseling for children who seem to have deepseated emotional problems and who, as a result, have difficulty with learning to read. The physical education department has organized a perceptual training program for young children who seem to need such training. Special attention has been given to the selection of easy-to-read, high-interest books in the school libraries. The whole area of instruction in reading has been observed and studied carefully. There is a close relationship between the remedial teacher and other teachers of reading.

VI. What evidence is there that the projects have been effective?

Since 1966 a file has been kept on all children who have had remedial reading. Each year additional data is included in the file. A study of this seven-year analysis indicates no pattern of regression.

VII. Can you cite specific success stories; for example, a specific child or children who benefited from the project? Describe briefly. Names are not requested, but use the child's age and grade.

Robert had practically no interest in reading during his three years in school. When the remedial reading teacher began giving certificates for proficiency in reading for the two hundred twenty basic sight words. Robert decided that his mother would like a certificate for her birthday. He worked at school, at home, and with his friends. One week before his mother's birthday, Robert read all the sight words!

Daniel had a wonderful oral language facility at fourth grade, yet his reading was slow, because he had difficulty with the mechanics of word recognition. He was exposed to a semester of a spelling approach to reading in which he was given phonics drill along with dictation of words which he spelled orally before writing them on the chalkboard. He used the controlled reader to speed up his reading. The standardized reading test that Daniel took last spring, and again this fall, indicated that he is reading at grade level.

Terry does not have much ability and has little interest in school and reading. For the first four years (one retention), he accomplished very little beyond letters and their sounds, thus being unable to read even pre-primer materials. This year, fourth grade, started with complete frustration as he entered a departmentalized situation and couldn't begin to cope with the subjects. He went to his home room teacher and his reading teacher and begged to be put in special reading classes. Here he found work he could do and has progressed to third grade level. Hopefully, with help next year, he will go much further. He is rapidly maturing and finding school much more interesting.

Jim is a sixth grader of low average ability. For six years (one retention), he has defied us to teach him to read. He used every defense mechanism imaginable to cover his inability to read. After six years about all he had learned was most of the letters and part of the sounds, but he was unable to read even pre-primer material. This year Jim has become the school hero because of his prowess as a halfback on the football team. Now he has demanded of us that we teach him to read, realizing he must be able to read to continue sports in junior high school. During the year he has progressed to the fourth grade level and gives every indication of continued progress. Best of all, his attitude toward books and all school has improved and he is proud of his achievement.

Rhonda is a fifth grader who suddenly stopped learning and even regressed in her reading ability due to emotional disturbances. After numerous sessions with the school counselor, the regular reading teacher, and the special reading teacher, she agreed to try to get back on the track. We used special books on subjects that helped her see her problems in perspective. She has made rapid progress and is reading well above her grade level. She is a happier child and again taking part in class and other school activities.

Harold is a quiet, industrious, no-nonsense (in class) third grader. He has one year of retention on his record and is nine years old. His mother is deceased and (reportedly) his father neither reads nor writes. Among his siblings he is a middle child. On the ability test records he is low (IQ 88) and on the reading achievement test he was reading at 1.4 grade level in September, 1969. Through his great desire to read and obvious enjoyment of books, he worked diligently and kept his attention riveted to the class work. By the end of the school term he had gained twelve months in reading achievment and had a grade score of 2.6. It is the feeling of the teacher that some part of the low scoring recorded in the pre-test results -- both ability and achievement-- is due to his being a type of child who works slowly and methodically and not because of any lack of comprehensive ability. He is slow but certainly not dull. The special reading program has helped him in realizing his learning potential.

Tom is from a broken home in which he is the youngest child and is given orders by all the older children. He is a third grader and eight years of age. He thrives on competition among his peers and has to be the first and best in everything. In programmed reading he kept a constant watch on his neighbors to assure himself and the teacher that he could outdo everyone in the classroom. In this he did succeed, for he went from a 1.4 reading level in September to a 4.1 level in May and showed evidence of excellent comprehension.

Charles is a fifth grader with a speech problem. On enrollment in the reading program he was achieving on a 3.9 level. He was concerned about his reading ability and worked industriously. After observing him closely for a few days we decided is main problem was his slowness in reading. An assignment for one day would require him two days before completion. We praised his work and talked to him about his slowness. We urged him each day to speed up. As he gained more confidence in his ability to read and to keep up with the class, he worked much faster. By the end of the year he was working at the same rate as his classmates and had gained nine months in measurable reading ability.

Alan is an eight year old third grader. His teacher was concerned because he didn't seem to comprehend what he read. He entered the remedial reading program the end of January, 1970. He was eager to improve and worked very hard in Barnell-Loft Finding the Answer and Getting the Facts, and also in the third year Reader's Digest. By June his comprehension was much improved, and his teacher felt he would not need to be in the program the following fall.

Virginia's first grade teacher doubted whether it was wise to send her on to second grade. She had been in our school only a few months, having transferred from a southern state. Virginia started second grade. She was a very poor reader and most unhappy in school. After a year in daily remedial reading classes she was reading at grade level. Her mother says that she loves to come to school now.

Jeffrey, a third grader, knew the alphabet and could make the sounds for nearly all the letters. However, he did not apply this knowledge when decoding words. He did not realize that the sounds of these letters --when put together--made words. He was also a very poor speller, because he didn't understand that a specific sound could be written down as a letter or group of letters. As we worked on phonics, he became adept at decoding words and is now doing "A" work in spelling.

VIII. Describe any training program involving both teachers and teacher aides. What was the total number of participants in each project? What was the general pattern of activity involved?

The training program for teachers involves weekly sessions on clinical methods of teaching reading for teachers new to the program and an after-school session once a month for those with experience. The time is used for discussing special problems, creating new materials for children with special needs, and reviewing current articles and experiments in teaching of reading. All seven remedial teachers are active in the International Reading Association and attend as many reading workshops as possible.

X. Please submit supportive materials and newsclips of your Title I projects.

Do not have that information.

XI. Any additional statements by the Lea in the evaluation for fiscal year 1970 are encouraged.

The evaluation of the program for the fiscal year of 1971 will be based on results gained through the use of the New Stanford Diagnostic Reading Test I and II, forms I and W.

Name of Test Pre Gates-MacGinitie Post "	Form Pre-Test D3	Form Post Test D2	Grade 6

Type of Title I Reading Activity (check as many as apply)

__Non provided
x Special Remedial Teacher
x Reading Consultant
x Teacher Aides
__Summer Remedial Reading
X Counseling
x Special Reading Materials
x Expanded Library Facilities,

Pre-Test Results		Post-Test Results	
Date of Test 9-69	Number of Pupils 31	Date of Test 5-70	Number of Pupils 31
Mean Grade Equivalent 4.44		Mean Grade Equivalent 5.77	

Number of Pupils by Percentile Categories National Norm.				Number of Pupils by Percentile Categories National Norm.			
Below 25	26-50th	51-75th	76-99th	Below 25	26-50th	51-75th	76-99th
24	7	0	0	12	16	3	0

Name of Test Pre Gates-MacGinitie Post "	Form Pre-test D-3	Form Post-test D-2	Grade 5

Type of Title I Reading Activity (check as many as apply)

__Non provided
x Special Remedial Teacher
x Reading Consultant
x Teacher Aides
__Summer Remedial Reading
x Special Reading Materials
x Expanded Library Facilities
x Other, (Specify)
Counseling

Pre-test Results		Post-test Results	
Date of Test 9-69	Number of Pupils 46	Date of Test 5-70	Number of Pupils 46
Mean Grade Equivalent 3.44		Mean Grade Equivalent 4.64	

Number of Pupils by Percentile Categories National Norms				Number of Pupils by Percentile Categories National Norms.			
Below 25	26-50th	51-75th	76-99th	Below 25	26-50th	51-75th	76-99th
38	8	0	0	20	19	7	0

White

Name of Test Pre Gates-MacGinitie Post "	Form Pre-Test D3	Form Post Test D2	Grade 4

Type of Title I Reading Activity (check as many as apply)

__Non provided
x Special Remedial Teacher
x Reading Consultant
x Teacher Aides
__Summer Remedial Reading
x Counseling
x Special Reading Materials
x Expanded Library Facilities,

Pre-Test Results		Post-Test Results	
Date of Test 9-69	Number of Pupils 62	Date of Test 5-70	Number of Pupils 62
Mean Grade Equivalent 2.83		Mean Grade Equivalent 3.71	

Number of Pupils by Percentile Categories National Norm.				Number of Pupils by Percentile Categories National Norm.			
Below 25	26-50th	51-75th	76-99th	Below 25	26-50th	51-75th	76-99th
47	14	1	0	35	22	5	0

Name of Test Pre Gates-MacGinitie Post "	Form Pre-test C 1	Form Post-test C 2	Grade 3

Type of Title I Reading Activity (check as many as apply)

__Non provided
x Special Remedial Teacher
x Reading Consultant
x Teacher Aides
__Summer Remedial Reading
x Special Reading Materials
x Expanded Library Facilities
x Other, (Specify)
Counseling

Pre-test Results		Post-test Results	
Date of Test 9-69	Number of Pupils 51	Date of Test 5-70	Number of Pupils 51
Mean Grade Equivalent 1.98		Mean Grade Equivalent 2.72	

Number of Pupils by Percentile Categories National Norms				Number of Pupils by Percentile Categories National Norms.			
Below 25	26-50th	51-75th	76-99th	Below 25	26-50th	51-75th	76-99th
40	10	0	0	31	17	2	0

Name of Test Pre Gates-MacGinitie Post "	Form Pre-Test B 1	Form Post Test B 2	Grade 2

Type of Title I Reading Activity (check as many as apply)

__Non provided
x Special Remedial Teacher
x Reading Consultant
x Teacher Aides
__Summer Remedial Reading
x Counseling
x Special Reading Materials
x Expanded Library Facilities,

Pre-Test Results		Post-Test Results	
Date of Test 9-69	Number of Pupils 43	Date of Test 5-70	Number of Pupils 43
Mean Grade Equivalent 1.37		Mean Grade Equivalent 2.39	

Number of Pupils by Percentile Categories National Norm.				Number of Pupils by Percentile Categories National Norm.			
Below 25	26-50th	51-75th	76-99th	Below 25	26-50th	51-75th	76-99th
28	13	2	0	22	16	5	0

Name of Test Pre Gates-MacGinitie Post "	Form Pre-test Pre-reading	Form Post-test A - Z	Grade 1

Type of Title I Reading Activity (check as many as apply)

__Non provided
x Special Remedial Teacher
x Reading Consultant
x Teacher Aides
__Summer Remedial Reading
x Special Reading Materials
x Expanded Library Facilities
x r, (Specify)
Counseling

Pre-test Results		Post-test Results	
Date of Test None	Number of Pupils 60	ate of Test 5-70	Number of Pupils 60
Mean Grade Equivalent Non-reader		Mean Grade Equivalent 1.61	

Number of Pupils by Percentile Categories National Norms				Number of Pupils by Percentile Categories National Norms.			
Below 25	26-50th	51-75th	76-99th	Below 25	26-50th	51-75th	76-99th

PAROCHIAL

Name of Test Pre Gates-MacGinitie Post "	Form Pre-Test D 3	Form Post Test D 2	Grade 6

Type of Title I Reading Activity (check as many as apply)

__Non provided
x Special Remedial Teacher
x Reading Consultant
__Teacher Aides
__Summer Remedial Reading
x Special Reading Materials
__Expanded Library Facilities,

Pre-Test Results		Post-Test Results	
Date of Test 9-69	Number of Pupils 11	Date of Test 5-70	Number of Pupils 11
Mean Grade Equivalent 4.21		Mean Grade Equivalent 5.87	

Number of Pupils by Percentile Categories National Norm.				Number of Pupils by Percentile Categories National Norm.			
Below 25	26-50th	51-75th	76-99th	Below 25	26-50th	51-75th	76-99th
8	3	0	0	4	4	3	0

Name of Test Pre Gates-MacGinitie Post "	Form Pre-test D 3	Form Post-test D 2	Grade 5

Type of Title I Reading Activity (check as many as apply)

__Non provided
x Special Remedial Teacher
x Reading Consultant
__Teacher Aides
__Summer Remedial Reading
x Special Reading Materials
__Expanded Library Facilities
__Other, (Specify)

Pre-test Results		Post-test Results	
Date of Test 9-69	Number of Pupils 13	Date of Test 5-70	Number of Pupils 13
Mean Grade Equivalent 3.50		Mean Grade Equivalent 4.91	

Number of Pupils by Percentile Categories National Norms				Number of Pupils by Percentile Categories National Norms.			
Below 25	26-50th	51-75th	76-99th	Below 25	26-50th	51-75th	76-99th
9	4	0	0	6	5	2	0

PAROCHIAL

Name of Test Pre Gates-MacGinitie Post "	Form Pre-Test	Form Post Test	Grade
	D 3	D 2	4

Type of Title I Reading Activity (check as many as apply)

__Non provided
x Special Remedial Teacher
x Reading Consultant
__Teacher Aides
__Summer Remedial Reading
x Special Reading Materials
__Expanded Library Facilities,

Pre-Test Results		Post-Test Results	
Date of Test 9-69	Number of Pupils 17	Date of Test 5-70	Number of Pupils 17
Mean Grade Equivalent 3.38		Mean Grade Equivalent 4.78	

Number of Pupils by Percentile Categories National Norm.				Number of Pupils by Percentile Categories National Norm.			
Below 25	26-50th	51-75th	76-99th	Below 25	26-50th	51-75th	76-99th
5	11	1	0	0	14	3	0

Name of Test Pre Gates-MacGinitie Post "	Form Pre-test	Form Post-test	Grade
	C 1	C 2	3

Type of Title I Reading Activity (check as many as apply)

__Non provided
x Special Remedial Teacher
x Reading Consultant
__Teacher Aides
__Summer Remedial Reading
x Special Reading Materials
__Expanded Library Facilities
__Other, (Specify)

Pre-test Results		Post-test Results	
Date of Test 9-69	Number of Pupils 10	Date of Test 5-70	Number of Pupils 10
Mean Grade Equivalent 2.01		Mean Grade Equivalent 3.85	

Number of Pupils by Percentile Categories National Norms				Number of Pupils by Percentile Categories National Norms.			
Below 25	26-50th	51-75th	76-99th	Below 25	26-50th	51-75th	76-99th
8	2	0	0	2	4	4	0

Distribution of Gains by Grades 4 Target Public Schools
3 Target Parochial

Grade	No. in Grade	Ave. Gain
2	47	10.5
3	67	9.3
4	83	9.8
5	63	12.7
6	45	14.6

Distribution of Gains by I.Q.

I.Q. Grade	No. of Children	Ave. Gain
100+	89	13.1
90-99	122	11.0
80-89	93	10.3
70-79	22	6.8
60-69	6	9.6
-59	1	11.0

Distribution of Gains by Grades

Grade	No. in Grade	Mean I. Q.	Ave. Gain	Inc.
1	34	95	13	4
2	20	94	11.75	3
3	17	89	8.5	4
4	19	90	9	2
5	16	88	9	2
6	10	94	14.5	2

Distribution of Gains by I. Q.

I. Q. Grade	No. of Children	Gain	Inc.
100+	24	13	2
90-99	40	11.33	4
80-89	36	10	3
70-79	6	2.4	1
60-69	1	11	
59-(55)	1	11	

Grade	No. from Broken Homes
1	6
2	3
3	2
4	4
5	2
6	3

School Battell

Teacher Mrs. Oberly

Date May 1970

Distribution of Gains by Grades

Grade	No. in Grade	Mean I. Q.	Ave. Gain	Inc.
1	7	98	5	
2	14	93	6.4	1
3	26	94	5.5	2
4	11	96	6.3	
5	18	93	14	1
6	16	88	9.8	1

Distribution of Gains by I. Q.

I. Q. Grade	No. of Children	Gain	Inc.
100+	21	8.6	2
90-99	32	8.6	2
80-89	27	7.7	2
70-79	7	2	
60-69			
59-			

Grade	No. from Broken Homes
1	2
2	2
3	6
4	3
5	3
6	3

School LaSalle

Teacher M. Million

Date May 1970

Distribution of Gains by Grades

Grade	No. in Grade	Mean I. Q.	Ave. Gain	Inc.
1	14	96	19	
2	13	100	12	2
3	13	97	9	
4	21	94	9	
5	3	83	8	
6				

Distribution of Gains by I.Q.

I. Q. Grade	No. of Children	Gain	Inc.
100+	23	14	
90-99	18	9	1
80-89	11	14	1
70-79	3	9	
60-69	3	10	
59- No I.Q. Score	6	10	

Grade	No. from Broken Homes
1	3
2	3
3	2
4	8
5	2
6	

School Phillips

Teacher W. Needham

Date May 1970

Distribution of Gains by Grades

Grade	No. in Grade	Mean I.Q.	Ave. Gain	Inc.
1	15	89		1
2				
3	1	88	15	
4	16	88	10.28	2
5	13	93	15.17	1
6	8	89	17.5	
Kdg.	16			

Distribution of Gains by I. Q.

I. Q. Grade	No. of Children	Gain	Inc.
100+	3	12.3	
90-99	15	13.3	
80-89	12	14.16	
70-79	5	16.25	1
60-69	1	2	
59			

Grade	No. from Broken Homes
K-	2
1	11
2	
3	1
4	7
5	2
6	3

School South Side

Teacher Betty Crofoot

Date May, 1970

Distribution of Gains by Grades

Grade	No. in Grade	Mean I. Q.	Ave. Gain .	Inc.
1				
2				
3				
4	3	115	14	
5	9	97	14	
6	8	97	13	

Distribution of Gains by I. Q.

I. Q. Grade	No. of Children	Gain	Inc.
100+	9	15	
90-99	6	15	
80-89	3	7	
70-79	1	11	
60-69	1	15	
59-			

Grade	No. from Broken Homes
1	
2	
3	
4	
5	1
6	2

School St. Bavo

Teacher M. Million

Date May 25, 1970

Distribution of Gains by Grades

Grade	No. in Grade	Mean I. Q.	Ave. Gain	Inc.
1				
2				
3				
4	3	96	13.66	
5	4	88	14.5	
6	3	96	26	

Distribution of Gains by I. Q.

I. Q. Grade	No. of Children	Gain	Inc.
100+	2	19.5	
90-99	6	20.5	
80-89	2	7.5	
70-79			
60-69			
59-			

Grade	No. from Broken Homes
1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	

School St. Joseph

Teacher B. Crofoot

Date May 1970

Distribution of Gains by Grades

Grade	No. in Grade	Mean I. Q.	Ave. Gain	Inc.
1				
2				
3	10	100	18	
4	10	94	$13\frac{1}{2}$	1
5				
6				

Distribution of Gains by I.Q.

I. Q. Grade	No. of Children	Gain	Inc.
100+	7	18.7	
90-99	5	8.6	
80-89	2	10	
70-79			
60-69			
59			

Grade	No. from Broken Homes
1	
2	
3	2
4	1
5	
6	

School St. Monica

Teacher Mrs. Oberly

Date May 1970

Number	Grade	Age	IQ	Vocabulary				Comprehension				Composite Voc. & Comp.			
				Raw Score	Standard Score	Percentile	Grade Score	Raw Score	Standard Score	Percentile	Grade Score	Standard Score	Percentile	Grade Score	Gain (Months)
1	6	12	94	15	31	3	3.2	19	35	7	3.0	33	4	3.1	
				*28	41	18	5.0	40	37	10	6.1	39	14	5.6	25
2	6	11	91	27	43	24	4.8	37	45	31	5.5	44	27	5.1	
				*37	54	66	7.6	41	49	46	6.5	52	58	7.0	19
3	6	11	90	34	52	58	6.5	32	43	24	4.7	47	38	5.6	
(1-27-70)				*36	53	62	7.2	47	58	79	9.5	56	73	8.4	28
4	6	12	100	30	46	34	5.5	38	48	42	5.6	47	38	5.5	
(1-26-70)				*33	49	46	6.2	42	51	54	6.8	50	50	6.5	10
5	6	12	87	24	40	16	4.4	33	44	27	4.8	42	21	4.6	
				*31	44	27	5.8	35	43	24	5.1	44	27	5.5	9
6	6	12	94	23	39	14	4.2	25	39	14	3.8	39	14	4.0	
				*32	45	31	6.0	39	36	8	5.8	41	18	5.9	19
7	6	11	83	25	50	16	4.5	38	47	38	5.6	43	24	5.0	
				*31	44	27	5.8	36	44	27	4.9	44	27	5.4	4
8	6	12	98	20	35	7	3.9	28	39	14	4.1	37	10	4.0	
				*23	36	8	4.2	28	37	10	4.1	37	10	4.2	2
9	6	12	87	22	39	14	4.1	26	39	14	3.9	39	14	4.0	Inc.
10	5		94	21	43	24	4.0	25	42	21	3.8	42	21	3.9	
				*32	51	54	6.0	36	48	42	5.3	50	50	5.7	18
11	5	10	98	27	49	46	4.8	35	50	50	5.1	49	46	4.9	
(1-26-70)				*30	51	54	5.5	40	52	58	6.1	52	58	5.8	9
12	5	11	92	28	50	50	5.0	29	45	31	4.2	47	38	4.6	Inc.

Mrs. Cberly, Teacher

BATTELL SCHOOL

Number	Grade	Age	IQ	Vocabulary				Comprehension				Composite Voc. & Comp.			
				Raw Score	Standard Score	Percentile	Grade Score	Raw Score	Standard Score	Percentile	Grade Score	Standard Score	Percentile	Grade Score	Gain (Months)
13	5	11	91	26	46	34	4.7	31	45	31	4.5	45	31	4.6	
(2-70)				*27	47	38	4.8	31	44	27	4.5	46	34	4.7	1
14	5	11	87	21	41	18	4.0	29	43	24	4.2	42	21	4.1	
				*23	42	21	4.2	26	40	16	3.9	41	18	4.0	
15	5	11	88	28	50	50	5.0	27	44	27	4.0	37	38	4.5	
				*29	48	42	5.2	43	54	66	7.1	51	54	6.2	17
16	5	11	71	14	35	7	3.1	19	37	10	3.0	36	8	3.0	
				*13	30	2	2.9	15	31	3	2.6	31	4	2.8	
17	5	11	88	13	32	4	2.9	23	39	14	3.4	35	7	3.1	
				*17	35	7	3.4	30	43	24	4.4	39	14	3.9	8
18	5	12	81	9			2.[illegible]							1.2	
				*25	44	27	4.5	18	36	8	2.9	40	16	3.7	25
19	5	12	90	17	37	10	3.4	22	38	12	3.3	37	10	3.3	
				*15	32	4	3.2	26	40	16	3.9	36	8	3.6	3
20	5	11	78	13	34	5	2.9	19	37	10	3.0	35	7	2.9	
(Clinic)				*14	31	3	3.1	18	33	4	2.9	32	4	3.0	1
21	5	11	76	17	37	10	3.4	19	36	8	3.0	36	8	3.2	
				*22	41	18	4.1	19	34	5	3.0	38	12	3.6	4
22	5	11	83	11	31	3	2.6	19	37	10	3.0	25	1	2.8	
				*22	41	18	4.1	30	43	24	4.4	42	21	4.3	15
23	5	11	93	12	33	4	2.7	19	37	10	3.0	26	1	2.8	
				*25	48	42	4.5	29	42	21	4.2	45	31	4.4	16
24	5	12	67	17	37	20	3.4	22	40	16	3.3	29	1	3.3	
				*22	36	8	4.1	32	41	18	4.7	39	14	4.4	11

Mrs. Cberly, Teacher

BATTELL SCHOOL

Number	Grade	Age	IQ	Vocabulary				Comprehension				Composite Voc. & Comp.			
				Raw Score	Standard Score	Percentile	Grade Score	Raw Score	Standard Score	Percentile	Grade Score	Standard Score	Percentile	Grade Score	Gain (Months)
25	5	11	[illegible]	18	38	12	3.5	22	38	12	3.3	38	12	3.4	Inc.
26	4	20	99	27	55	69	4.8	23	47	38	3.4	51	54	4.1	
				*27	50	50	4.8	40	56	73	6.1	53	62	5.5	14
27	4	9	96	24	52	58	4.4	21	45	31	3.2	48	42	3.8	Inc.
28	4	9	83	18	45	31	3.5	24	48	42	3.6	46	34	3.5	
				*23	46	34	4.2	28	45	31	4.1	46	34	4.2	7
29	4	9	96	17	44	27	3.4	21	45	31	3.2	44	27	3.3	
				*26	49	46	4.7	23	42	21	3.4	16	34	4.0	7
30	4	10	87	19	47	38	3.7	17	41	18	2.8	44	27	3.2	
				*21	44	27	4.0	25	43	24	3.8	44	27	3.9	7
31	4	10	116	17	44	27	3.4	11	36	8	2.3	40	16	2.8	
				*25	48	42	4.5	21	40	16	3.2	44	27	3.9	11
32	4	10	97	19	47	38	3.7	17	41	18	2.8	44	27	3.2	
				*22	45	31	4.1	23	42	21	3.4	44	27	3.8	6
33	4	9	104	9	31	3	2.3	22	46	34	3.3	38	12	2.8	
				*19	42	21	3.7	23	42	21	3.4	42	21	3.6	8
34	4	10	103	17	44	27	3.4	18	42	21	2.9	48	24	3.1	
				*18	40	16	3.5	23	42	21	3.4	41	18	3.5	4
35	4	9	93	18	45	31	3.5	15	39	14	2.6	42	21	3.0	
				*23	42	34	4.2	25	43	24	3.8	45	31	4.0	10
36	4	11	88	18	45	31	3.5	15	39	14	2.6	42	21	3.0	
				*22	45	31	4.1	30	47	38	4.4	46	34	4.3	13

Mrs. Oberly, Teacher

BATTELL SCHOOL

Number	Grade	Age	IQ	Vocabulary				Comprehension				Composite Voc. & Comp.			
				Raw Score	Standard Score	Percentile	Grade Score	Raw Score	Standard Score	Percentile	Grade Score	Standard Score	Percentile	Grade Score	Gain (Months)
37	4	10	88	19	47	38	3.7	11	36	8	2.3	40	16	3.0	
				*23	46	34	4.2	18	37	10	2.9	42	21	3.6	6
38	4	9	105	18	45	31	3.5	17	42	18	2.8	43	24	3.1	
				*31	54	66	5.8	37	48	42	5.5	51	54	5.7	26
39	4	11	84	9	31	3	2.3	15	39	14	2.6	35	7	2.4	
(Clinic)				*13	32	4	2.9	16	35	7	2.7	34	5	2.8	4
40	4	10	90	7			2.0	15	39	14	2.6	19	1	2.3	
(Clinic)				*16	36	18	3.3	25	43	24	3.8	40	16	3.5	12
41	4	10	80	8			2.1	19	40	16	3.0	20	1	2.5	
(Clinic)				*18	40	16	3.5	25	43	24	3.8	46	21	3.7	12
42	4	9	82	13	39	14	2.9	18	42	21	2.9	40	16	2.9	
(2/70)				*22	45	31	4.1	18	37	10	2.9	41	18	3.5	6
43	4	11	81	13	39	14	2.9	15	39	14	2.6	39	14	2.7	
(1/70)				*18	40	16	2.4	20	39	14	3.1	40	16	3.3	6
44	4	11		13	35	7	2.9	12	34	5	2.4	34	5	2.6	Inc.
45	3	9	80	18	40	16	2.0	12	39	14	1.8	39	14	1.9	
				*23	40	16	2.6	20	42	21	2.7	41	18	2.7	8
46	3	10	96	17	39	14	1.8	6	30	2	1.5	34	5	1.6	Inc.
47	3	9	85	7			1.3	11	38	12	1.7	19	1	1.5	
				*17	33	4	1.8	14	36	8	2.0			1.9	4
48	3	9	83	4			1.8	3							
				*25	42	21	2.8	15	37	10	2.2	40	16	2.5	25

Mrs. Oberly, Teacher

BATTELL SCHOOL

Number	Grade	Age	IQ	Vocabulary				Comprehension				Composite Voc. & Comp.			
				Raw Score	Standard Score	Percentile	Grade Score	Raw Score	Standard Score	Percentile	Grade Score	Standard Score	Percentile	Grade Score	Gain (Months)
49	3	9	81	16	38	12	1.6	19	47	38	2.6	42	21	2.1	
				*33	48	42	3.6	29	48	42	3.6	48	42	3.6	15
50	3	9	90	18	40	16	2.0	12	30	14	1.8	39	14	1.9	
				*25	42	21	2.8	25	46	34	3.2	44	27	2.0	11
51	3	9	89	20	43	24	2.3	11	38	12	1.7	40	16	2.0	
				*19	36	8	2.2	12	33	4	1.8	35	7	2.0	
52	3	20	82	11	30	2	1.5	8	32	4	1.5	31	2	1.5	
				*23	40	16	2.6	19	41	18	2.6	41	3	2.6	11
53	3	9	100	21	44	27	2.4	17	45	31	2.4	44	27	2.4	
				*34	49	46	3.7	26	46	34	3.3	48	42	3.5	11
54	3	8	90	17	39	14	1.8	16	44	27	2.3	41	18	2.0	
				*22	39	14	2.5	19	41	18	2.6	40	16	2.6	6
55	3	10	78	14	35	14	2.5	19	41	18	2.6	40	16	2.6	
(Clinic)				*14	30	2	1.6	9	9					1.6	
56	3	9	95	26	49	46	2.9	14	42	21	2.0	45	31	2.4	
				*23	40	16	2.6	31	50	50	3.9	45	31	3.3	9
57	3	9	91	26	49	46	2.9	19	47	38	2.6	48	42	2.7	
(1-70)				*30	45	31	3.3	19	41	18	2.6	44	27	3.0	3
58	3	9		26	26	45	2.9	25	48	42	3.2	37	10	3.0	Inc.
(1/21/70)															
59	3	9	92	16	38	12	1.6	15	43	24	2.2	40	16	1.9	Inc.
60	3	9	83	18	40	16	2.0	16	44	27	2.3	42	21	2.1	Inc.
61	3	9	98	17	36	8	1.8	14	39	14	2.0	37	10	1.9	
				*22	39	14	2.5	20	42	21	2.7	41	18	2.6	7

Mrs. Oberly, Teacher

BATTELL SCHOOL

Number	Grade	Age	IQ	Vocabulary				Comprehension				Composite Voc. & Comp.			
				Raw Score	Standard Score	Percentile	Grade Score	Raw Score	Standard Score	Percentile	Grade Score	Standard Score	Percentile	Grade Score	Gain (Months)
62	2	8	78	9	34	5	1.2	8	41	18	1.4	37	10	1.3	
				*22	41	18	1.8	16	41	18	2.2	41	18	2.0	7
63	2	8	89	13	40	16	1.4	5	35	7	1.2	37	10	1.3	
				*33	49	46	2.8	26	53	62	3.6	51	54	3.2	19
64	2	7	112	17	45	31	1.5	5	35	7	1.2	40	16	2.3	Inc.
65	2	8	93	11	37	10	1.3	10	46	34	1.6	50	50	1.4	
				*20	39	14	1.7	17	42	21	2.3	41	18	2.0	6
66	2	7	107	19	47	38	1.6	9	44	27	1.5	45	31	1.5	
				*33	49	46	2.8	17	42	21	2.3	46	34	2.6	11
67	2	8	87	14	41	18	1.4	11	47	38	1.6	44	27	1.5	
				*27	44	27	2.4	13	38	12	1.8	41	18	2.1	6
68	2	7	101	15	42	21	1.5	5	35	7	1.2	38	12	1.3	
				*36	51	54	3.3	23	49	46	2.8	50	50	3.0	17
69	2	8	94	14	41	18	1.4	8	41	18	1.4	41	18	1.4	
				*32	48	42	2.7	21	47	38	2.6	48	42	2.7	13
70	2	8	83	15	42	21	1.5	6	38	12	1.3	40	16	1.4	
				*36	51	54	3.3	22	48	42	2.7	50	50	3.0	16
71	2	8	114	18	46	34	1.6	11	47	38	1.6	46	34	1.6	Inc.
72	2	9	94	11	33	4	1.3	11	41	18	1.6	37	10	1.4	
				*14	33	4	1.4	12	37	10	1.7	35	7	1.6	2
73	2	8	83	6				1					1		
				*21	40	16	1.7	15	40	16	2.1	40	16	1.9	19
74	2	8	84	15	42	21	1.5	10	46	34	1.6	44	27	1.5	
				*32	48	42	2.7	18	43	24	2.4	46	34	2.6	11

Mrs. Cberly, Teacher

BATTELL SCHOOL

Number	Grade	Age	IQ	Vocabulary				Comprehension				Composite Voc. & Comp.			
				Raw Score	Standard Score	Percentile	Grade Score	Raw Score	Standard Score	Percentile	Grade Score	Standard Score	Percentile	Grade Score	Gain (Months)
75	2	8	111	21	49	46	2.7	6	38	12	1.3	43	24	1.5	
				*32	48	42	2.7	21	47	38	2.6	48	42	2.7	12
76	2	7	105	20	48	42	1.7	10	46	34	1.6	47	38	1.5	
				*27	44	27	2.4	30	58	79	4.5	51	54	3.5	20
77	2	8		19	47	38	1.6	11	47	38	1.6	47	38	1.6	Inc.
78	2	9	102	17	45	31	1.5	14	51	54	1.9	47	38	1.7	
				*30	47	38	2.6	13	38	12	1.8	43	24	2.2	5
79	2	8	95	15	42	21	1.5	12	49	46	1.7	45	31	1.6	
				*37	52	58	3.5	27	54	66	3.7	53	62	3.6	20
80	2	8	91	28	55	69	2.5	17	54	66	2.3	54	66	2.4	
				*34	50	50	2.9	24	50	50	3.1	50	50	3.0	6
81	2	9	109	23	45	31	1.9	13	43	24	1.8	44	27	1.8	
(2/70)				*34	50	50	2.9	20	46	34	2.5	48	42	2.7	9
82	1	7	90				Readiness								
				*42	54	66	2.6	25	55	69	2.3			2.5	25
83	1	7	122	19	46	34	1.4	11	47	38	1.4			1.4	
				*28	42	21	1.6	18	47	38	1.7			1.7	3
84	1	7	107	31	56	73	1.7	10	45	31	1.4			1.5	
				*43	55	69	2.7	29	58	79	2.8			2.8	13
85	1	7	80	24	50	50	1.5	10	45	31	1.4			1.4	
				*37	50	50	2.1	16	45	31	1.6			1.9	5
86	1	8	93	12				11	47	38	1.4			.7	
				*37	50	50	2.1	24	54	66	2.2			2.2	15

Mrs. Oberly, Teacher

BATTELL SCHOOL

Number	Grade	Age	IQ	Vocabulary Raw Score	Vocabulary Standard Score	Vocabulary Percentile	Vocabulary Grade Score	Comprehension Raw Score	Comprehension Standard Score	Comprehension Percentile	Comprehension Grade Score	Composite Voc. & Comp. Standard Score	Composite Voc. & Comp. Percentile	Composite Voc. & Comp. Grade Score	Gain (Months)
87	1	7	90	8	33	4		8	42	21	1.3			.6	
				*20	36	8	1.4	10	35	7	1.4			1.4	8
88	1	7	82					Readiness							
				*18	35	7	1.4	10	35	7	1.4			1.4	14
89	1	8	91					Readiness							
				*16	33	4	1.3	17	46	34	1.6			1.5	15
90	1	8	110					Readiness							
				*20	38	8	1.4	14	42	21	1.5			1.5	15
91	1	7	105					Readiness							
				*38	51	54	2.2	15	43	24	1.6			1.9	19
92	1	7						Readiness							Inc.
				*											
93	1	7	97					Readiness							
				*38	51	54	2.2	10	35	7	1.4			1.8	18
94	1	7	89	13	40	16		13	51	54	1.5			.7	
				*21	37	10	1.4	6	29	2	1.2			1.3	6
95	1	7	118					Readiness							
				*24	39	14	1.5	11	37	10	1.4			1.5	15
96	1	8	84	10	36	8		6	37	10	1.2			.6	
				*21	37	10	1.4	17	46	34	1.6			1.5	9
97	1	7	89					Readiness							
				*22	38	12	1.5	18	47	38	1.7			1.6	16
98	1	7	88					Readiness							
				*22	38	12	1.4	10	35	7	1.4			1.4	14

Mrs. Cberly, Teacher

BATTELL SCHOOL

Number	Grade	Age	IQ	Vocabulary Raw Score	Vocabulary Standard Score	Vocabulary Percentile	Vocabulary Grade Score	Comprehension Raw Score	Comprehension Standard Score	Comprehension Percentile	Comprehension Grade Score	Composite Voc. & Comp. Standard Score	Composite Voc. & Comp. Percentile	Composite Voc. & Comp. Grade Score	Gain (Months)
99	1	7		Clinic - Readiness - No test given											
100	1	6					Readiness								
				*36	49	46	1.0	12	38	12	1.5			1.8	18
101	1	6	96				Readiness								
				*17	34	5	1.3	17	46	34	1.6			1.5	15
102	1	7	87	12	39	14		8	42	21	1.3			.6	
				*33	47	38	1.8	21	37	10	1.4			1.6	10
103	1	8	110				Readiness								
				*29	43	24	1.6	21	50	50	1.9			1.8	18
104	1	8	107				Readiness								
				*42	54	66	2.6	25	55	69	2.3			2.4	24
105	1	7	100	19	46	34	1.4	9	44	27	1.4			1.4	
				*31	45	31	1.7	20	49	46	1.8			1.8	4
106	1	7	55	12				6			1.2			.6	
				*31	45	31	1.7	17	46	34	1.6			1.7	11
107	1	7	95				Readiness								
				*24	39	14	1.5	18	47	38	1.7			1.6	16
108	1	7	90	12				7			1.3			.6	
				*37	50	50	2.1	21	50	50	1.9			2.0	14
109	1	7	98	30	55	69	1.7	14	53	62	1.5			1.6	
				*41	53	62	2.5	27	57	76	2.5			2.5	9
110	1	7	110				Readiness								
				*31	45	31	1.7	12	38	12	1.5			1.6	16

Mrs. Oberly, Teacher

BATTELL SCHOOL

Number	Grade	Age	IQ	Vocabulary				Comprehension				Composite Voc. & Comp.			
				Raw Score	Standard Score	Percentile	Grade Score	Raw Score	Standard Score	Percentile	Grade Score	Standard Score	Percentile	Grade Score	Gain (Months)
11	1	7	110	12				10	43	31	1.4			.7	
				*36	49	46	2.0	25	55	69	2.3			2.2	15
112	1	8	83	26	52	58	1.6	16	56	13	1.6			1.6	
				*41	53	62	2.5	23	53	62	2.1			2.3	7
113	1	7	96	30	55	69	1.7	19	59	82	1.7			1.7	
				*33	47	38	1.8	23	53	62	2.1			2.0	3

Number	Grade	Age	IQ	Vocabulary				Comprehension				Composite Voc. & Comp.			
				Raw Score	Standard Score	Percentile	Grade Score	Raw Score	Standard Score	Percentile	Grade Score	Standard Score	Percentile	Grade Score	Gain (Months)
1	6	11	89	24	40	16	4.4	36	46	34	5.3	43	24	4.8	
				*24	37	10	4.4	34	42	21	4.9	40	16	4.7	
2	6	12	98	25	41	18	4.5	24	34	31	5.1	43	24	4.8	
(1-20-70)				*21	36	8	4.0	42	51	54	6.8	44	27	5.4	6
3	6	12	91	29	45	31	5.2	31	42	21	4.5	43	24	4.8	
				*27	40	16	4.8	37	45	31	5.5	43	24	5.2	4
4	6	11	105	29	45	31	5.2	32	43	24	4.7	44	27	4.9	
				*32	45	31	6.0	41	49	46	6.5	47	38	6.3	14
5	6	11	93	27	43	24	4.8	33	44	27	4.8	43	24	4.8	
				*34	49	46	6.5	37	45	31	5.5	47	38	6.0	12
6	6	12	90	22	39	14	4.1	35	46	34	5.3	42	21	4.7	
				*28	41	18	5.0	43	51	54	7.1	46	34	6.0	13
7	6	11	88	27	43	24	4.8	33	44	27	4.8	43	24	4.8	
				*33	47	38	6.2	37	45	31	5.5	46	34	5.9	11
8	6	13	83	14	29	2	3.1	15	30	2	2.6	29	1	2.8	
				*15			3.2	24	36	8	3.6	18	1	3.4	6
9	6	11	76	21	38	12	4.0	32	43	24	4.7	40	16	4.3	
				*24	37	10	4.4	28	37	10	4.1	37	10	4.3	
10	6	12	82	24	40	16	4.4	31	42	21	4.5	41	18	4.4	
				*27	40	16	4.8	48	58	79	10.6	49	46	7.7	33
11	6	11	82	18	34	5	3.5	26	39	14	3.9	36	8	3.7	
				*24	37	10	4.4	26	36	8	3.9	37	10	4.2	5
12	6	12	95	25	41	18	4.5	24	38	12	3.6	39	14	4.0	Inc.

M. Million, Teacher

LASALLE SCHOOL

Number	Grade	Age	IQ	Vocabulary				Comprehension				Composite Voc. & Comp.			
				Raw Score	Standard Score	Percentile	Grade Score	Raw Score	Standard Score	Percentile	Grade Score	Standard Score	Percentile	Grade Score	Gain (Months)
13	6	12	84	22	39	14	4.1	24	38	12	3.6	38	12	3.8	
				*25	38	12	4.5	32	41	18	4.7	40	16	4.6	8
14	6	12	88	24	40	16	4.4	32	43	24	4.7	41	18	4.5	
				*31	44	27	5.8	45	53	62	8.1	49	46	7.0	15
15	6	12	86	26	41	18	4.7	31	41	18	4.5	41	18	4.6	
				*28	41	18	5.0	39	47	38	5.9	44	27	5.4	8
16	6	11	123	29	43	24	5.2	37	46	34	5.5	44	27	5.3	
				*34	49	46	6.5	41	49	46	6.5	49	46	6.5	12
17	5	10	99	27	49	46	4.8	18	36	8	2.9	42	21	3.8	
				*30	49	46	5.5	31	44	27	4.5	47	38	5.0	12
18	5	10	93	25	47	38	4.5	23	40	16	3.4	43	24	3.9	
				*27	46	34	4.8	32	44	27	4.7	45	31	4.8	9
19	5	10	93	20	42	21	3.9	26	43	24	3.9	42	21	3.9	
				*23	42	21	4.2	36	48	42	5.3	45	31	4.8	9
20	5	12	86	29	51	54	5.2	16	35	7	2.7	43	24	3.9	
				*21	40	16	4.0	22	37	10	3.3	39	14	3.7	
21	5	11	101	15	36	8	3.2	27	44	27	4.0	40	16	3.6	
				*37	58	79	7.6	39	50	50	5.8	54	66	6.7	31
22	5	10	98	23	45	31	4.2	27	44	27	4.0	44	27	4.1	
				*31	50	50	5.8	44	56	73	7.6	53	62	6.7	26
23	5	10	102	27	49	46	4.8	20	38	12	3.1	43	24	3.9	
				*30	49	46	5.5	37	48	42	5.5	49	46	5.5	16
24	5	10	98	25	47	38	4.5	20	38	12	3.1	42	21	3.8	
				*33	53	62	6.2	40	51	54	6.1	52	58	6.2	24

Number	Grade	Age	IQ	Vocabulary				Comprehension				Composite Voc. & Comp.			
				Raw Score	Standard Score	Percentile	Grade Score	Raw Score	Standard Score	Percentile	Grade Score	Standard Score	Percentile	Grade Score	Gain (Months)
25	5	11	90	11	31	3	2.6	17	36	8	2.8	33	4	2.7	
				*23	42	21	4.2	19	34	5	3.0	38	12	3.6	9
26	5	10	86	24	46	34	4.4	15	34	5	2.6	40	16	3.5	
				*28	47	38	5.0	35	47	38	5.1	47	38	5.1	16
27	5	12	88	16	37	10	3.3	16	35	7	2.7	36	8	3.0	
				*28	36	8	3.5	21	36	8	3.2	35	8	3.4	4
28	5	12	78	12	33	4	2.7	11			2.3	16	1	2.5	
				*13	30	2	2.9	16	32	4	2.7	31	4	2.8	3
29	5	11	94	18	40	16	3.5	19	37	10	3.0	38	12	3.2	
				*24	43	24	4.4	40	51	54	6.1	47	38	5.3	21
30	5	10	87	21	43	24	4.0	17	36	8	2.8	39	14	3.4	
				*30	49	46	5.5	37	48	42	5.5	49	46	5.5	21
31	5	11		12	33	4	2.7	7				16	1	2.7	Inc.
32	5	12	85	16	37	10	3.3	18	36	8	2.9	36	8	3.1	
				*25	44	27	4.5	31	44	27	4.5	44	27	4.5	15
33 (1-70)	5	12	107	19	41	18	3.7	19	37	10	3.0	39	14	3.3	
				*22	41	18	4.1	22	37	10	3.3	39	14	3.7	4
34 (1-70)	5	12	72	12	33	4	2.7	9			2.2	16	1	2.4	
				*17	35	7	3.4	15	31	3	2.6	33	5	3.0	6
35	4	10	86	13	39	14	2.9	8	34	5	2.2	36	8	2.5	
				*12	30	2	2.7	17	36	8	2.8	33	5	2.8	3
36	4	10	102	9	31	3	2.3	11	36	8	2.3	33	4	2.3	
				*19	42	21	3.7	10	30	2	2.3	36	8	3.0	7

M. Million, Teacher

LASALLE SCHCOL

Number	Grade	Age	IQ	Vocabulary				Comprehension				Composite Voc. & Comp.			
				Raw Score	Standard Score	Percentile	Grade Score	Raw Score	Standard Score	Percentile	Grade Score	Standard Score	Percentile	Grade Score	Gain (Months)
37	4	10	86	9	31	3	2.3	7	32	4		31	2	1.1	
				*14	34	5	3.1	14	34	5	2.5	34	5	2.8	17
38	4	9	104	12	36	8	2.7	15	39	14	3.6	37	10	3.6	
				*12	30	2	2.7	26	44	27	3.9	37	10	3.3	7
39	4	10	102	18	45	31	3.5	14	39	14	2.5	42	21	3.0	
				*13	32	4	2.9	14	34	5	2.5	33	5	2.7	
40	4	8	98	18	45	31	3.5	21	45	31	3.2	45	31	3.3	
				*23	46	34	4.2	26	44	27	3.9	45	31	4.1	8
41	4	9	95	14	41	18	3.1	21	45	31	3.2	43	24	3.1	
(1-70)				*21	46	34	4.0	30	49	46	4.4	48	42	4.2	11
42	4	10	96	18	45	31	3.5	12	37	10	2.4	41	18	1.9	
				*14	34	5	3.1	24	42	21	3.6	38	12	3.4	5
43	4	9	101	10	33	4	2.4	9	35	7	2.2	34	5	2.3	
				* 6			2.4	10			2.5		1	2.5	2
44	4	10	80	10	33	4	2.4	12	37	10	2.4	35	7	2.4	
				*22	45	31	4.1	9	30	2	2.2	38	12	3.2	8
45	4	10	75	19	44	27	3.7	21	42	21	3.2	43	24	3.4	
				*23	46	34	4.2	19	38	12	3.0	42	21	3.6	2
46	3	9	98	17	39	14	1.8	10	36	8	1.6	37	10	1.7	
				*16	32	4	1.6	10	30	2	1.6	31	4	1.6	
47	3	8	95	17	39	14	1.8	12	39	14	1.8	39	14	1.8	
				*18	35	7	2.0	17	39	14	2.4	37	10	2.2	4
48	3	8	98	15	37	10	1.6	12	39	14	1.8	38	12	1.7	
				*32	47	38	3.5	15	37	10	2.2	42	21	2.9	12

Number	Grade	Age	IQ	Vocabulary				Comprehension				Composite Voc. & Comp.			
				Raw Score	Standard Score	Percentile	Grade Score	Raw Score	Standard Score	Percentile	Grade Score	Standard Score	Percentile	Grade Score	Gain (Months)
49	3	9	91	16	38	12	1.6	18	46	34	2.5	42	21	2.0	
				*27	43	24	3.0	23	44	27	3.0	43	24	3.0	10
50	3	9	88	21	44	27	2.4	15	43	24	2.2	43	24	2.3	
				*19	36	8	2.2	15	37	10	2.2	36	8	2.2	
51	3	9	116	26	49	46	2.9	10	36	8	1.6	42	21	2.2	Inc.
52	3	8	88	22	45	31	2.5	11	38	12	1.7	41	18	2.1	
				*32	47	38	3.5	29	48	42	3.6	47	38	3.6	15
53	3	9	85	13	34	5	1.5	5			1.4	17	1	1.45	
				*23	40	16	2.6	16	38	12	2.3	39	14	2.5	11
54	3	8	122	20	43	24	2.3	15	43	24	2.2	43	24	2.2	
				*19	36	8	2.2	14	36	8	2.0	36	8	2.1	
55	3	8	102	20	43	24	2.3	13	41	18	1.9	42	21	2.1	
				*41	57	76	4.1	22	48	42	2.7	53	62	3.4	13
56	3	8	105	20	43	24	2.3	5			1.4	21	1	1.8	
				*15	31	3	1.6	21	43	24	2.8	37	10	2.2	4
57	3	8	94	14	35	7	1.6	13	41	18	1.9	38	12	1.75	
				*24	41	18	2.7	13	35	7	1.9	37	10	2.3	6
58	3	11	77	13	34	5	1.5	13	41	18	1.9	37	10	1.7	
				*17	33	4	1.8	12	33	4	1.8	33	5	1.8	1
59	3	8	89	19	42	21	2.2	10	36	8	1.6	39	14	1.9	
				*27	43	24	3.0	11	32	4	1.7	37	10	2.4	5
60	3	8	94	22	45	31	2.5	10	36	8	1.6	40	16	2.0	

M. Million, Teacher

LASALLE SCHOOL

Number	Grade	Age	IQ	Vocabulary				Comprehension				Composite Voc. & Comp.			
				Raw Score	Standard Score	Percentile	Grade Score	Raw Score	Standard Score	Percentile	Grade Score	Standard Score	Percentile	Grade Score	Gain (Months)
61	3	10	83	23	46	34	2.6	14	42	21	2.0	44	27	2.3	
				*21	38	12	2.4	13	35	7	1.9	36	8	2.1	
62	3	9	98	20	43	24	2.3	16	44	27	2.3	43	24	2.3	
				*37	52	58	4.2	31	50	50	3.9	51	54	4.0	7
63	3	8	95	20	43	24	2.3	9	34	5	1.6	38	12	1.95	
				*16	32	4	1.6	11	32	4	1.7	36	4	1.65	
64	3	8	101	20	43	24	2.3	14	42	21	2.0	42	21	2.15	
(1-70)				*32	50	50	3.5	26	49	46	3.3	49	46	3.4	
65	3	8	87	25	48	42	2.8	12	39	14	1.8	43	24	2.3	
				*23	40	16	2.6	24	45	31	3.1	42	21	2.9	6
66	3	8	81	12	33	4	1.5	10	36	8	1.6	34	5	1.5	
				*17	33	4	1.6	13	35	47	1.9	34	5	1.7	2
67	3	9	98	23	46	34	2.6	19	47	38	2.6	46	34	2.6	
				*29	45	31	3.2	20	42	21	2.7	44	27	3.0	4
38	3	9	94	27	46	34	3.0	16	41	18	2.3	43	24	2.6	
*1-70)				*26	42	21	2.9	23	44	27	3.0	43	24	3.0	4
69	3	8	111	33	51	54	3.6	22	46	34	2.9	47	38	3.2	
				*30	45	31	3.3	26	46	34	3.3	46	34	3.3	1
70	3	9	84	27	46	34	3.0	18	43	24	2.5	44	27	2.7	
(1-70)				*33	48	42	3.6	22	43	24	2.9	46	34	3.3	6
71	3	9		16	35	7	1.6	17	42	21	2.4	38	12	2.0	
(2-70)				*29	45	31	3.2	21	43	24	2.8	44	27	3.0	10
72	2	8	84	15	42	21	1.5	5	35	7	1.2	38	12	1.35	
				*21	40	16	1.7	11	36	8	1.6	38	12	1.65	3

M. Million, Teacher

LASALLE SCHOOL

				Vocabulary				Comprehension				Composite Voc. & Comp.			
Number	Grade	Age	IQ	Raw Score	Standard Score	Percentile	Grade Score	Raw Score	Standard Score	Percentile	Grade Score	Standard Score	Percentile	Grade Score	Gain (Months)
73	2	7	85	15	42	21	1.5	6	38	12	1.3	40	16	1.4	Inc.
74	2	7	102	11	37	10	1.3	7	39	14	1.4	38	12	1.35	
				*33	49	46	2.8	17	42	21	2.3	46	34	2.55	12
75	2	8	99	13	40	16	1.4	7	39	14	1.4	39	14	1.4	
				*24	42	21	2.0	17	42	21	2.3	42	21	2.15	8
76	2	7	111	14	41	18	1.4	9	44	27	1.5	42	21	1.45	
				*30	47	38	2.6	16	41	18	2.2	45	31	2.4	10
77	2	7	102	14	41	18	1.4	8	41	18	1.4	41	18	1.4	
				*18	41	18	1.6	11	41	18	1.6	41	18	1.6	2
78	2	7	107	20	48	42	1.7	4	34	5		41	18	.8	
(1-70)				*25	47	38	2.2	9	37	10	1.5	42	21	1.8	10
79	2	8	91	16	44	27	1.5	9	44	27	1.5	44	27	1.5	
(1-70)				*19	42	21	1.6	11	41	18	1.6	42	21	1.6	1
80	2	8	76	15	42	21	1.5	10	46	34	1.6	44	27	1.5	
				*22	41	18	1.8	11	36	8	1.6	39	14	1.7	2
81	2	7	96	18	46	34	1.6	6	38	12	1.3	41	18	1.4	
				*24	42	21	2.0	11	36	8	1.6	39	14	1.8	4
82	2	7	113	12	39	14	1.3	9	44	27	1.5	41	18	1.4	
				*22	41	18	1.8	20	46	34	2.5	44	27	2.15	8
83	2	7	104	15	38	12	1.5	7	33	4	1.4	35	7	1.45	
				*29	46	34	2.5	18	43	24	2.4	45	31	2.45	10
84	2	8	91	14	37	10	1.4	17	47	38	2.3	42	21	1.8	
				*26	43	24	2.3	16	41	18	2.2	42	21	2.25	4
85	2	8	85	12	39	14	1.3	4	34	5		36	8	.65	
(1-70)				*17	40	16	1.5	11	41	18	1.6	41	18	1.55	9

Number	Grade	Age	IQ	Vocabulary				Comprehension				Composite Voc. & Comp.			
				Raw Score	Standard Score	Percentile	Grade Score	Raw Score	Standard Score	Percentile	Grade Score	Standard Score	Percentile	Grade Score	Gain (Months)
86	1	6	79	15	42	21	1.3	8	42	21	1.3	42		1.3	
				*17	34	5	1.3	15	43	24	1.6			1.45	1
87	1	7		13	40	16		9	44	27	1.4	42		.7	
				*13	40	16		13	40	16	1.5			1.5	8
88	1	7	98	13	40	16		14	53	62	1.5	46		.75	
				*24	39	14	1.5	13	40	16	1.5			1.5	8
89	1	7	99	10	36	8		9	44	27	1.4	40		.7	
				*23	39	14	1.5	9	35	7	1.4			1.45	8
90	1	7	98	13	40	16		5	35	7		36			
				*10	36	8		14	53	62	1.5			.75	8
91	1	6		13	40	16		10	45	31	1.4	42		.7	
				* 9				13	40	16	1.5			.75	
92	1	7		24	50	50	1.5	11	47	39	1.4	48		1.45	
				*28	42	21	1.6	16	56	73	1.6			1.6	2

M. Million, Teacher

LASALLE SCHOOL

				Vocabulary				Comprehension				Composite Voc. & Comp.			
Number	Grade	Age	IQ	Raw Score	Standard Score	Percentile	Grade Score	Raw Score	Standard Score	Percentile	Grade Score	Standard Score	Percentile	Grade Score	Gain (Months)
1	5	11	91	13	34	5	2.9	30	46	34	4.4	40	16	3.7	
				*23	42	21	4.2	32	44	27	4.7	43	24	4.5	8
2	5	11.	83	9			2.3	15	34	5	2.6	17	1	2.5	
				*12	30	2	2.7	17	33	4	2.8	32	4	2.8	3
3	5	11	69	12	33	4	2.7	19	43	24	3.0	38	12	2.9	
				*23	42	31	4.2	29	42	21	4.2	42	21	4.2	13
4	4	10	100	6				12	37	10	2.4	18	1	1.2	
				*19	42	21	3.7	14	34	5	2.5	38	12	3.1	19
5	4	9	103	19	47	38	3.7	21	45	31	3.2	46	34	3.5	
				*19	42	21	3.7	23	42	21	3.4	42	21	3.6	1
6	4	10	91	12	36	8	2.7	24	48	42	3.6	42	21	3.2	
				*22	45	31	4.1	27	41	31	4.0	45	31	4.1	9
7	4	10	93	15	42	21	3.2	25	48	42	3.8	45	31	3.5	
				*29	52	58	5.2	38	54	66	5.6	53	62	5.4	19
8	4	10	95	13	39	14	2.9	16	40	16	2.7	39	14	2.8	
				*24	47	38	4.4	24	42	21	3.6	45	31	4.0	12
9	4	9	103	11	35	7	2.6	17	41	18	2.8	38	12	2.7	
				*18	40	16	3.5	27	45	31	4.0	43	24	3.8	11
10	4	10	87	3				5		1			1	NR	
				* 9			2.3	7		1			1	1.2	12
11	4	9	98	11	35	7	2.6	21	45	31	3.2	40	16	2.9	
				*15	35	7	3.2	20	39	14	3.1	37	10	3.2	3
12	4	10	70	17	44	27	3.4	18	42	21	2.9	43	24	3.2	
				*27	50	50	4.8	10	30	2	2.3	40	16	3.6	4

Winifred Needham, Teacher

PHILLIPS SCHOOL

Number	Grade	Age	IQ	Vocabulary				Comprehension				Composite Voc. & Comp.			
				Raw Score	Standard Score	Percentile	Grade Score	Raw Score	Standard Score	Percentile	Grade Score	Standard Score	Percentile	Grade Score	Gain (Months)
13	4	9	90	11	35	7	2.6	18	42	21	2.9	38	12	2.8	
				*14	34	5	3.1	21	40	16	3.2	37	10	3.2	4
14	4	9	96	15	38	12	3.2	13	35	7	2.5	36	8	2.9	
				*19	42	21	3.7	27	45	31	4.0	44	27	3.9	10
15	4	11	100	16	43	24	3.3	18	42	21	2.9	42	21	3.1	
				*13	32	4	2.9	9	30	2	2.2	31	4	2.6	5
16	4	9	99	19	47	38	3.7	33	54	66	4.8	50	50	4.3	
				*25	48	42	4.5	35	51	54	5.1	50	50	4.8	5
17	4	10	87	21	49	46	4.0	13	38	12	2.5	43	24	3.3	
				*27	50	50	4.8	25	43	24	3.8	47	38	4.4	11
18	4	9	86	17	44	27	3.4	28	51	54	4.1	47	38	3.8	
				*29	52	58	5.2	28	45	31	4.1	49	46	4.7	
19	4	9	94	21	49	46	4.0	22	46	34	3.3	47	38	3.7	
				*17	39	14	3.4	34	50	50	4.9	45	31	4.2	5
20	4	10	88	6			.	9	35	7	2.2	17	1	1.1	
				*19	42	21	3.7	19	38	12	3.0	40	16	3.4	23
21	4	9	109	23	51	54	4.2	25	48	42	4.5	49	46	4.4	
				*31	54	66	5.8	31	47	38	4.5	51	54	5.2	8
22	4		69	9			2.3	12	32	4	2.4	16	1	2.4	
				*12	30	2	2.7	10	30	2	2.3	30	2	2.5	1
23	4			17	41	18	3.4	28	53	62	4.1	44	27	3.8	
				*21	44	27	4.0	33	49	46	4.8	47	38	4.4	6
24	4	10		21	46	34	4.0	20	41	18	3.1	43	24	3.6	
				*30	53	62	5.5	25	43	24	3.8	48	42	4.7	9

Winifred Needham, Teacher PHILLIPS SCHOOL

Number	Grade	Age	IQ	Vocabulary				Comprehension				Composite Voc. & Comp.			
				Raw Score	Standard Score	Percentile	Grade Score	Raw Score	Standard Score	Percentile	Grade Score	Standard Score	Percentile	Grade Score	Gain (Months)
25	3	8	105	12	33	4	1.5	9	35	5	1.6	34	5	1.6	
				*23	40	16	2.6	20	42	21	2.7	41	18	2.7	11
26	3	8	114	10			1.4	4			1.4		1	1.4	
				*20	37	10	2.3	20	42	21	2.7	40	16	2.5	9
27	3	8	95	19	42	21	2.2	11	38	12	1.7	40	16	1.9	
				*16	32	4	1.6	17	39	14	2.4	36	8	2.0	1
28	3	8	92	22	45	31	2.5	19	47	38	2.6	46	34	2.5	
				*28	44	27	3.1	24	45	31	3.1	45	31	3.1	6
29	3	9	79	18	40	16	2.0	14	42	21	2.0	41	18	2.0	
				*29	45	31	3.2	27	50	50	3.4	48	42	3.3	13
30	3	9	97	21	44	27	2.4	18	46	34	2.5	45	31	2.4	
				*36	51	54	4.0	30	49	46	3.7	50	50	3.9	15
31	3	8	116	16	38	12	1.6	6	30	2	1.5	34	5	1.6	
				*31	46	34	3.4	30	49	46	3.7	48	42	3.6	20
32	3	8	123	23	46	34	2.6	6	30	2	1.5	38	12	2.0	
				*35	52	58	3.9	28	48	42	3.5	50	50	3.7	17
33	3	8	97	19	42	21	2.2	10	36	8	1.6	39	14	1.9	
				*31	46	34	3.4	29	48	42	3.6	47	38	3.5	16
34	3	9	97	18	40	16	2.0	13	41	18	1.9	40	16	2.0	
				*22	39	14	2.5	23	44	27	3.0	42	21	2.8	8
35	3	9	88	29	57	54	3.2	16	44	27	2.3	47	38	2.8	
				*22	39	14	2.5	16	38	12	2.3	39	14	2.4	
36	3	10	93	22	42	21	2.5	15	40	16	2.2	41	18	2.4	
				*22	39	14	2.5	24	45	31	3.1	42	21	2.8	4

Winifred Needham, Teacher

PHILLIPS SCHOOL

Number	Grade	Age	IQ	Vocabulary				Comprehension				Composite Voc. & Comp.			
				Raw Score	Standard Score	Percentile	Grade Score	Raw Score	Standard Score	Percentile	Grade Score	Standard Score	Percentile	Grade Score	Gain (Months)
37	3	9		24	43	24	2.7	18	43	24	2.5	43	24	2.6	
				*23	40	16	2.6	20	42	21	2.7	41	18	2.7	1
38	2	7	100	12	39	14	1.3	7	39	14	1.4	39	14	1.3	
				*30	47	38	2.6	20	46	34	2.5	47	38	2.6	13
39	2	7	103	7	30	2		7	39	14	1.4	34	5	.7	
				*24	42	21	2.0	17	42	21	2.3	42	21	2.2	15
40	2	7	96	17	45	31	1.5	6	38	12	1.3	41	18	1.4	
				*36	51	54	3.3	31	61	86	4.7	55	69	4.0	26
41	2	8	110	14	41	18	1.4	13	50	50	1.8	45	31	1.6	
				*26	43	24	2.4	12	37	10	1.7	40	16	2.1	5
42	2	8	86	12	39	14	1.3	13	50	50	1.8	44	27	1.5	Inc.
43	2	7	93	9	34	5	1.2	10	46	34	1.6	40	16	1.4	Inc.
44	2	7	107	15	42	21	1.5	13	50	50	1.8	46	34	1.6	
				*28	45	31	2.5	15	39	14	1.9	42	21	2.2	6
45	2	7	114	16	44	27	1.5	9	44	27	1.5	44	27	1.5	
				*36	54	54	3.3	25	52	58	3.4	53	62	3.4	19
46	2	7	112	13	40	16	1.4	7	39	14	1.4	39	14	1.4	
				*30	47	38	2.6	14	39	14	1.9	43	24	2.3	9
47	2	7	100	23	51	54	1.9	5	35	7	1.2	43	24	1.6	
				*39	55	69	3.7	19	45	31	2.5	50	50	3.1	15
48	2	7	106	21	49	46	1.7	3	32	4		40	16	.9	
				*29	46	34	2.5	12	37	10	1.7	42	21	2.1	12
49	2	8	77	11	37	10	1.3	4	34	5		35	7	.7	
				*15	34	5	1.5	11	36	8	1.6	35	7	1.6	9

Winifred Needham, Teacher PHILLIPS SCHOOL

Number	Grade	Age	IQ	Vocabulary				Comprehension				Composite Voc. & Comp.			
				Raw Score	Standard Score	Percentile	Grade Score	Raw Score	Standard Score	Percentile	Grade Score	Standard Score	Percentile	Grade Score	Gain (Months)
50	2	7	97	20	43	24	1.7	19	49	26	2.5	46	34	2.1	
				*33	49	46	2.8	19	45	31	2.5	47	38	2.7	6
51	2	8	96	20	43	24	1.7	13	43	24	1.8	43	24	1.8	
				*32	48	42	2.7	17	42	21	2.3	45	31	2.5	7
52	2	8		15	38	12	1.5	4	30	2		34	5	.8	
				*17	36	8	1.5	13	38	12	1.8	37	10	1.7	9
53	1	6	105	32	46	34	1.7	20	49	46	1.8			1.8	
54	1	7	88	34	58	79	1.8	17	57	76	1.6			1.7	
55	1	7	88	30	44	27	1.7				1.7			1.7	
56	1	7	111	42	54	66	2.6	27	57	76	2.5			2.6	
57	1	6		30	44	27	1.7	17	40	34	1.6			1.7	
58	1	7		36	49	46	2.0	20	49	46	1.8			1.9	
59	1	6	103	42	54	66	2.6	29	58	79	2.8			2.7	
60	1	6	121	34	47	38	1.8	17	46	34	1.6			1.7	
61	1	6	105	20	36	8	1.4	13	40	16	1.5			1.5	
62	1	8	67	31	45	31	1.7	15	43	24	1.6			1.7	
63	1	8	83	38	51	54	2.2	13	40	16	1.5			1.9	
64	1	6	89	36	49	46	2.0	21	50	50	1.9			2.0	
65	1	7	84	36	49	46	2.0	14	42	21	1.5			1.8	
66	1	6	113	37	50	50	2.1	17	46	34	1.6			1.9	

Winifred Needham, Teacher PHILLIPS SCHOOL

Number	Grade	Age	IQ	Vocabulary				Comprehension				Composite Voc. & Comp.			
				Raw Score	Standard Score	Percentile	Grade Score	Raw Score	Standard Score	Percentile	Grade Score	Standard Score	Percentile	Grade Score	Gain (Months)
1	6	11	101	27	43	24	4.8	38	48	42	5.6	45	33	5.2	
(1-70)				*31	45	31	5.8	42	52	58	6.8	49	46	6.3	11
2	6	11	97	31	47	38	5.8	8	34	5	3.0	40	22	4.9	
				*39	57	76	8.4	47	57	76	9.5	57	76	9.0	41
3	6	13	83	26	42	21	4.7	37	47	38	5.5	44	29	5.1	
(1-20-70				*36	53	62	7.2	41	50	50	6.5	52	56	6.9	18
4	6	12	89	21	38	12	4.0	25	39	14	3.8	38	13	3.9	
				*28	41	18	5.0	37	45	31	5.5	43	24	5.3	14
5	6	12	78	14	29	2	3.1	23	38	12	3.4	33	7	3.2	
				*35	51	54	6.8	30	39	14	4.4	45	32	5.6	24
6	6	12	86	18	34	5	3.5	19	35	7	3.0	34	6	3.2	
				*31	44	27	5.8	28	37	10	4.1	41	19	5.0	18
7	6	11	94	21	38	12	4.0	21	37	10	3.2	37	11	3.6	
				*29	41	18	5.2	21	34	5	3.2	37	12	4.2	6
8	6	12	89	27	43	24	4.8	29	41	18	4.2	42	21	4.6	
				*32	45	31	6.0	34	42	21	4.9	44	27	5.5	10
9	5	10	92	20	42	21	3.9	13	31	3	2.5	36	12	3.2	
				*28	47	38	5.0	28	41	18	4.1	44	28	4.7	15
10	5	10	95	10	29	2	2.4	21	39	14	3.2	34	8	2.8	
				*29	48	42	5.2	28	41	18	4.1	44	27	4.7	19
11	5	11	98	26	48	42	4.7	30	46	34	4.4	47	38	4.5	
				*34	54	66	6.5	41	52	58	6.5	53	62	6.5	20
12	5	11	97	19	41	18	3.7	32	47	38	4.7	44	28	4.2	
				*31	50	50	5.8	37	48	42	5.5	49	46	5.7	17

B. Crofoot, Teacher

SOUTH SIDE SCHOOL

Number	Grade	Age	IQ	Vocabulary				Comprehension				Composite Voc. & Comp.			
				Raw Score	Standard Score	Percentile	Grade Score	Raw Score	Standard Score	Percentile	Grade Score	Standard Score	Percentile	Grade Score	Gain (Months)
13	5	10	85	22	44	27	4.1	13	31	3	2.5	37	15	3.3	
				*35	55	69	6.8	29	42	21	4.2	49	45	5.5	22
14	5	10	92	28	50	50	5.0	24	41	18	3.6	45	34	4.3	
				*34	54	66	6.5	34	46	34	4.9	50	50	5.7	14
15	5	10	105	9			2.3	9			2.2			2.2	
				*22	41	18	4.1	20	35	7	3.1	38	13	3.6	14
16	5	10	94	16	37	10	3.3	13	31	3	2.5	34	6	2.9	
				*24	44	27	4.4	10			2.3	22	1	3.3	4
17	5	11	94	21	43	24	4.0	23	40	16	3.4	41	20	3.7	
				*30	49	46	5.5	38	49	46	5.6	49	46	5.6	19
18	5	11	68	26	48	42	4.7	31	47	38	4.5	47	40	4.6	
				*27	46	34	4.8	32	44	27	4.7	45	31	4.8	2
19	5			18	40	16	3.5	15	34	5	2.6	37	10	3.0	Inc.
20	5	13	80	27	47	38	4.8	22	38	12	3.3	42	25	4.0	
				*32	51	54	6.0	40	51	54	6.1	51	54	6.1	21
21	5	12	79	22	42	21	4.1	28	43	24	4.1	42	22	4.1	
				*35	55	69	6.8	30	43	24	4.4	49	46	5.6	15
22	4	8	92	9	31	3	2.3	14	39	14	2.5	35	8	2.4	
				*19	42	21	3.7	13	33	4	2.5	34	9	3.1	7
23	4	10	79	16	43	24	3.3	3					1	1.6	
				*24	47	38	4.4	15	34	5	2.6	41	22	3.5	19
24	4	8	107	16	43	24	3.3	12	37	10	2.4	40	17	2.8	
				*27	50	50	4.8	21	40	16	3.2	45	33	4.0	12

B. Crofoot, Teacher

SOUTH SIDE SCHOOL

Number	Grade	Age	IQ	Vocabulary				Comprehension				Composite Voc. & Comp.			
				Raw Score	Standard Score	Percentile	Grade Score	Raw Score	Standard Score	Percentile	Grade Score	Standard Score	Percentile	Grade Score	Gain (Months)
25	4	10	86	10	33	4	2.4	14	39	14	2.5	36	9	2.4	
				*15	35	7	3.2	15	34	5	2.6	35	6	2.9	5
26	4	9	90	13	39	14	3.1	18	42	21	2.9	40	17	3.0	
				*21	44	27	4.0	18	37	10	2.9	41	19	3.5	5
27	4	10	88	15	42	21	3.2	11	36	8	2.3	39	14	2.7	
				*17	39	14	3.4	11	31	3	2.3	35	9	2.9	2
28	4	13	91												
				*10			2.4	14	34	5	2.5		1	2.5	
29	4	9	82	14	41	18	3.1	17	41	18	2.8	41	18	2.9	
				*24	47	38	4.4	17	36	8	2.8	42	23	3.6	7
30	4	11	72	16	43	24	3.3	23	47	38	3.4	45	31	3.3	
				*25	48	42	4.5	23	42	21	3.4	45	32	4.0	7
31	4	8		21	49	46	4.0	16	40	16	2.7	44	31	3.3	Inc.
32	4	10	97	13	39	14	2.9	20	44	27	3.1	51	20	3.0	
				*29	52	58	5.2	25	43	24	3.8	48	41	4.5	15
33	4	9	87	23	48	42	4.2	19	40	16	3.0	44	29	3.6	
				*35	61	86	6.8	27	45	31	4.0	53	62	5.4	18
34	4	10	94	22	47	38	4.1	16	37	10	2.7	42	24	3.4	
				*30	53	62	5.5	22	41	18	3.3	47	40	4.4	10
35	4	9	94	18	42	21	3.5	14	36	8	2.5	39	14	3.0	
				*22	45	31	4.1	12	32	4	2.4	38	18	3.3	3
36	3	8	88	Non-reader											
				*27	42	21	1.6	10	35	7	1.4	39	14	1.5	15

B. Crofoot, Teacher

SOUTH SIDE SCHOOL

Number	Grade	Age	IQ	Vocabulary				Comprehension				Composite Voc. & Comp.			
				Raw Score	Standard Score	Percentile	Grade Score	Raw Score	Standard Score	Percentile	Grade Score	Standard Score	Percentile	Grade Score	Gain (Months)
37	1	6	89	Non Reader			.4				0			.2	2
38	1	7	71	Non Reader			.7				.9			.8	8
39	1	6	90												
40	1	8	94												
41	1	6	90	Non Reader			.7				1.3			1.0	10
42	1	7	74	Non Reader			.5				.6			.6	6
43	1	6	70	Non Reader			.7				1.4			1.1	11
44	1	7	99												
45	1	6	92												
46	1	6													
47	1	7	70	Non Reader			.5				.3			.4	4
48	1	7	117	Non Reader			.6				1.7			1.2	12
49	1	6	78	Non Reader			.7				1.0			.9	9
50	1	6	105	Non Reader			.6				1.1			.9	9
51	1	7	80												

Number	Grade	Age	IQ		Vocabulary Raw Score	Vocabulary Standard Score	Vocabulary Percentile	Vocabulary Grade Score	Comprehension Raw Score	Comprehension Standard Score	Comprehension Percentile	Comprehension Grade Score	Composite Voc. & Comp. Standard Score	Composite Voc. & Comp. Percentile	Composite Voc. & Comp. Grade Score	Gain (Months)
1	6	11	99		27	43	24	4.8	16	32	4	2.7	37	20	3.7	
				*	32	45	31	6	44	52	58	7.6	49	46	6.8	31
2	6	11	101		31	47	38	5.8	32	43	24	4.7	45	31	5.2	
				*	31	44	27	5.8	36	44	27	5.3	44	27	5.6	4
3	6	11	107		32	48	42	6	28	40	16	4.1	44	27	5.0	
				*	29	42	21	5.2	34	42	21	4.9	42	21	5.1	1
4	6	11	101		25	41	18	4.5	23	38	12	3.4	39	14	3.9	
				*	34	49	46	6.5	44	52	58	7.6	52	54	6.6	27
5	6	11	95		35	53	62	6.8	16	32	4	2.7	42	21	4.7	
				*	29	42	21	5.2	38	46	34	5.6	44	27	5.4	7
6	6	12	95		28	44	27	5	18	34	5	2.9	39	14	3.9	
				*	32	45	31	6	37	45	31	5.5	45	31	5.8	19
7	6		78		25	41	18	4.5	23	38	12	3.4	39	14	3.9	
				*	23	36	8	4.2	39	47	38	5.8	42	21	5.0	11
8	6	11	88		28	50	50	5	29	45	31	4.2	47	38	4.6	
				*	29	42	21	5.2	34	42	21	4.9	42	21	5.1	5
9	5	10	121		23	45	31	4.2	14	33	4	2.5	39	14	3.3	
				*	38	59	82	8	28	41	18	4.1	50	50	6.0	27
10	5	10	107		18	40	16	3.5	21	39	14	3.2	39	14	3.3	
				*	27	46	34	4.8	34	46	34	4.9	46	34	4.9	16
11	5	10	97		19	41	18	3.7	24	41	18	3.6	41	18	3.6	
				*	24	43	24	4.4	31	44	27	4.5	44	27	4.5	9
12	5	12	88		18	40	16	3.5	21	39	14	3.2	39	14	3.3	
				*	22	41	18	4.1	27	41	18	4	41	18	4.1	8

Number	Grade	Age	IQ		Vocabulary Raw Score	Vocabulary Standard Score	Vocabulary Percentile	Vocabulary Grade Score	Comprehension Raw Score	Comprehension Standard Score	Comprehension Percentile	Comprehension Grade Score	Composite Voc. & Comp. Standard Score	Composite Voc. & Comp. Percentile	Composite Voc. & Comp. Grade Score	Gain (Months)
13	5	10	110		25	47	38	4.5	17	36	8	2.8	41	18	3.6	
				*	32	51	54	6	40	51	54	6.1	51	54	6.1	25
14	5	12	84		14	35	7	3.1	9			2.2	17	1	2.6	
				*	17	35	7	3.4	24	38	12	3.6	37	10	3.5	9
15	5	12	67		25	47	38	4.5	24	41	28	3.6	44	27	4.0	
				*	30	49	46	5.5	37	48	42	5.5	49	46	5.5	15
16	5	10	103		25	57	38	4.5	24	41	18	3.6	44	27	4.0	
				*	24	43	24	4.4	25	39	14	3.8	41	18	4.1	1
17	5	11	95		21	43	24	4	30	46	34	4.4	44	27	4.2	
				*	35	55	69	6.8	33	45	31	4.8	50	50	5.8	16
18	4	10	115		20	48	42	3.9	12	37	10	2.4	42	21	3.1	
				*	27	50	50	4.8	29	46	34	4.2	48	42	4.5	14
19	4	10	91		16	43	24	3.3	22	50	50	3.3	46	34	3.3	
				*	22	45	31	4.1	29	46	34	4.2	46	34	4.2	9
20	4	10	124		23	51	54	4.2	15	39	14	2.6	45	31	3.4	
				*	29	52	58	5.2	38	54	66	5.6	53	62	5.4	20

M. Million , Teacher

ST. BAVC SCHCCI

Number	Grade	Age	IQ	Vocabulary				Comprehension				Composite Voc. & Comp.			
				Raw Score	Standard Score	Percentile	Grade Score	Raw Score	Standard Score	Percentile	Grade Score	Standard Score	Percentile	Grade Score	Gain (Months)
1	6	11	96	21	38	12	4.0	23	38	12	3.4	38	12	3.7	
				*26	39	14	4.7	29	38	12	4.2	39	14	4.5	8
2	6	12	90	24	40	16	4.4	24	38	12	3.6	39	14	4.0	
				*40	58	79	8.8	42	50	50	6.8	54	66	7.8	38
3	6	11	106	31	47	38	5.8	7			2.0	23	1	3.7	
				*36	52	58	7.2	41	49	46	6.5	51	54	6.9	32
4	5	10	100	15	36	8	3.2	21	39	14	3.2	37	11	3.2	
				*22	41	18	4.1	24	38	12	3.6	40	16	3.9	7
5	5	11	84	20	42	21	3.9	8			2.2	21	1	3.0	
				*23	42	21	4.2	15	31	3	2.6	19	1	3.4	4
6	5	10	99	21	43	24	4.0	29	45	31	4.2	44	27	4.1	
				*42	66	96	9.5	43	54	66	7.1	60	84	8.3	42
7	5	10	93	19	41	18	3.7	19	37	10	3.0	39	14	3.	
				*25	44	27	4.5	19	34	5	3.0	39	14	3.	
8	4	9	97	12	36	8	2.7	15	39	14	2.5	37	11	2.6	
				*22	45	31	4.1	24	42	21	3.6	44	27	3.9	13
9	4	10	96	18	45	42	3.5	29	43	24	3.0	44	27	3.2	
				*29	52	58	5.2	31	47	38	4.5	50	50	4.9	17
10	4	10	89	19	47	38	3.7	17	41	18	2.8	44	28	3.2	
				*25	48	42	4.5	27	45	31	4.0	47	38	4.3	

Betty Crofoot,

ST. JOSEPH SCHOOL

Number	Grade	Age	IQ	Vocabulary				Comprehension				Composite Voc. & Comp.			
				Raw Score	Standard Score	Percentile	Grade Score	Raw Score	Standard Score	Percentile	Grade Score	Standard Score	Percentile	Grade Score	Gain (Months)
1	4	9	98	14	41	18	3.1	13	38	12	2.5	39	14	2.8	
				*25	48	42	4.5	25	43	24	3.8	45	31	4.2	14
2	4	10	94	19	47	38	3.7	25	48	42	3.8	47	38	3.7	
				*27	50	50	4.8	30	47	38	4.4	48	42	4.6	9
3 (2-70)	4	9		20	48	42	3.9	27	50	50	4.0	49	46	3.9	
				*36	62	88	7.2	28	45	31	6.8	53	62	7.0	31
4	4	9	115	23	51	54	4.2	19	43	24	3.0	47	38	3.6	
				*24	47	38	4.4	33	49	46	4.8	48	42	4.6	10
5	4	10		21	49	46	4.0	20	44	27	3.1	46	34	3.5	Inc.
6	4	10	92	19	47	38	3.7	19	43	24	3.0	45	31	3.3	
				*31	54	66	4.5	31	47	38	4.5	50	50	4.5	12
7	4	9		19	47	38	3.7	18	42	21	2.9	44	27	3.3	
				*28	51	54	5.0	34	50	50	4.9	51	50	5.0	17
8	4	10		23	51	54	4.2	13	38	12	2.5	39	14	3.3	
				*28	51	54	5.0	22	41	18	3.3	46	34	4.2	9
9	4	10	90	21	49	46	4.0	15	39	14	2.6	44	27	3.3	
				*24	47	38	4.4	27	45	31	4.0	46	34	4.2	9
10	4	9	99	19	47	38	3.7	16	40	16	2.7	43	24	3.2	
				*23	46	34	4.2	27	45	31	4.0	46	34	4.1	9
11 (2-70)	4	11	86	20	48	42	3.9	28	51	54	4.1	49	46	4.0	
				*26	49	46	4.7	35	51	54	5.1	50	50	4.9	9
12	4	11	102	27	55	69	4.8	32	53	62	4.7	54	66	4.7	
				*38	65	93	8.0	37	53	62	5.5	59	82	6.8	21

Mrs. Oberly, Teacher

St. Monica School

Number	Grade	Age	IQ	Vocabulary				Comprehension				Composite Voc. & Comp.			
				Raw Score	Standard Score	Percentile	Grade Score	Raw Score	Standard Score	Percentile	Grade Score	Standard Score	Percentile	Grade Score	Gain (Months)
13	3	8	110	20	43	24	2.3	7	31	3	1.5	37	10	1.9	
				*39	54	66	4.6	36	53	62	4.7	54	66	4.7	28
14	3	8	100	20	43	24	2.3	8	32	4	1.5	37	10	1.9	
				*36	51	54	4.0	29	48	42	3.6	50	50	3.8	19
15	3	9		22	45	31	2.5	13	41	18	1.9	43	24	2.2	
				*33	48	42	3.6	23	44	27	3.0	46	34	3.3	11
16	3	10	85	14	35	7	1.6	8	32	4	1.5	34	5	1.5	
				*21	38	12	2.4	23	44	27	3.0	41	18	2.7	12
17	3	8	100	18	40	16	2.0	9	34	5	1.6	37	10	1.8	
				*39	54	66	4.6	36	53	62	4.7	54	66	4.7	29
18	3	8	120	12	33	4	1.5	14	42	21	2.0	37	10	1.7	
				*23	40	16	2.6	22	43	24	2.9	42	21	2.8	11
19	3	10		23	46	34	2.6	11	38	12	1.7	42	21	2.1	
				*33	48	42	3.6	28	48	42	3.5	48	42	3.6	15
20	3	8		21	44	27	2.4	13	41	18	1.9	41	18	2.1	
				*37	52	58	4.2	33	51	54	4.3	52	58	4.3	22
21	3	8		20	43	24	2.3	17	45	31	2.4	44	27	2.3	
				*35	50	50	3.9	40	57	76	5.4	54	66	4.7	24
22	3	8	110	30	52	58	3.3	13	41	18	1.9	46	34	2.6	
				*35	50	50	3.9	31	50	50	3.9	50	50	3.9	13

Mrs. Oberly, Teacher

ST. MONICA SCHOOL

ESEA TITLE I ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT

Name of Project Pre-school Adjustment

Total Cost of Project $14,947.00 Number of Participants 134

Date Started 9-2-69 Date Ended 6-5-70 Will it be Continued Yes x No

I. What type and age of children are participating in the projects? Indicate grade levels, public and/or non-public, dropouts, and preschoolers when appropriate.

Children who are four years of age on or before September 1 and who live within the geographical boundaries of the school attendance districts of the Title I target schools may participate in the Pre-school Adjustment Program.

II. Describe the projects. Give a brief narrative description highlighting their unique or outstanding features.

The Pre-school Adjustment Program or Nursery School as it is commonly termed, is a well-balanced series of sound educational activities geared to the normal growth and needs of 4-5 year olds. The highlight of the various activities is the emphasis upon the development of motor-perceptual skills through the physical education teacher in the school and the nursery school teacher. We feel that good coordination of both the large and small muscles has much to do with a child's orderly growth pattern leading to success in basic academic work--namely reading--when he reaches the first year primary years and the time he normally begins to read. Other aspects include a program of outdoor play, handwork and the other forms of indcor play, listening, singing, speaking, artistic work and other activities that are supervised.

III. What is the total number of children who are involved in your Title I program? Count a child only once regardless of how many programs he participates in.

The total number of children in the Pre-school Adjustment Program in the four schools is 134.

IV (a) Have you used any state funds to augment your Title I program? If so, describe the programs involved giving data such as: objectives, number of participants, and level of funding.

State funds for nursery school education are not available now.

Pink

IV. (b) Have you coordinated your Title I program with other federally funded programs?

The pre-school program was precipitated to a great extent by the analysis of the Title I Remedial Reading Program. Youngsters with reading problems often had adjustment problems in beginning school years. The nursery school program is hoped to be a preventive program of future school failures. Longitudinal studies should determine this conviction.

V. What effect has the Title I program had on the administrative structure of educational practice in your school system?

The administrative structure of the school system has been dramatically changed because of the Title I program. What was formerly a school system organized on a kindergarten through grade twelve basis is now a nursery school through grade twelve system. In-service programs are organized on the pre-primary level, primary, intermediate, junior high, and high school levels.

VI. What evidence is there that the projects have been effective?

Two schools have experienced the program for two years when the experiment was tried and supported locally. The youngsters in these schools consequently participated in the kindergarten program during the past year. Children who had been involved in the nursery school program were grouped in a kindergarten class with their peers of like experience. The other kindergarten class in each of these schools contained only children who had not been involved in the nursery school program. The kindergarten teachers and the principals of the schools noted that those children who had nursery schools experience excelled in:

A. Listening and following directions

B. Functioning positively in the group

C. Using materials and tools (paint, scissors, paste, etc.)

D. Knowledge of school routines

E. Courtesy

F. Finishing one task before going to another project

G. Sharing experiences and in using good thoughts in speaking

H. Better speech habits

I. Knowledge of fairy and folk stories and nursery rhymes

J. Music activities - singing, listening and rhythmics

K. Creativity in art and dramatic play

L. Dressing themselves - coat buttons, tying hoods, lacing shoes, putting on boots, etc.

During the coming year (1970-71) we will further evaluate in a similar way. Additionally, we will assess, informally, the first year primary program for those children who had nursery school experience.

VII. Can you cite specific success stories: for example, a specific child or children who benefited from the project? Describe briefly. Names are not requested, but use the child's age or grade.

Mike is a happy-go-lucky, bright four-year-old whose unwillingness to cooperate in anything was a deterrent to the welfare of the group. He had never, according to the mother, cooperated at home either. Facing up to the disapproval of the group, his teacher, and principal for four months was unpleasant enough for him that more normal group cooperation became the pattern. Now, in kindergarten, his cooperative attitude allows him, the teacher, and the group to participate in normal activities enjoyably.

Mary Ann's coordination problems were quite severe - so much so that specialized medical help has been and is necessary. The coordination activities (climbing, balancing, skipping, running, and walking) improved her motor skills remarkably. She also was anti-social and reluctant to show emotion about anything - especially laughter or even a smile. With patience, understanding, becoming a part of the pre-school group, and in gaining confidence in her own motor activity she could never before achieve, Mary Ann has become a well-adjusted primary student.

Johnny had temper tantrums at the slightest provocation. Here again the nursery program afforded him the experiences of group participation in which he discovered his "flare-ups" didn't work. He is now in kindergarten with no sign of his early behavior. The pre-school adjustment program gave him a year's "headstart" in teaching him to cope with his particular, though not unique, problem. This kind of self-realization manifested through the skilled direction of the teacher is an oft repeated success story.

VIII. Describe any training program involving both teachers and teacher aides. What was the total number of participants in each project? What was the general pattern or activity involved?

Nursery school teachers in the Title I schools met almost daily in the first two weeks of September 1969, for intensive training, orientation, and discussion. The teacher of one of the experimental schools and the principal of the same school conducted this training program. The group also met periodically throughout the year with the same leaders as consultants. Visitations by the new teachers to observe the consultant's program of nursery and kindergarten were made. Follow-up conferences and discussions were important aspects of these visitations.

ESEA TITLE I ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT

Name of Project Varied Remedial Instruction for Institutionalized Children

Total Cost of Project $4,659.10 Number of Participants 19

Date Started 3/10/69 Date Ended 8/28/70 Will it be Continued Yes x No

I. What type and age of children are participating in the project? Indicate grade levels, public and/or non-public, dropouts, and preschoolers when appropriate.

The age of children participating in projects ranged from second grade to ninth grade. All attended the public schools of Mishawaka with the exception of two boys who were dropouts.

II. Describe the projects. Give a brief narrative description highlighting their unique or outstanding features.

The project at the Family and Children's Center was purposefully designed to augment and/or supplement the children's school activities, particularly those children who were having problems adjusting to the academic environment and normal achievement levels desired in their school programs.

The objectives of the program were two-fold: First to raise the academic level of the institutionalized children and to help the emotionally handicapped child establish himself in a secure fashion within the regular school system. For those children who have been excluded from the regular school system or who have "dropped out", the objectives would be in line with preparing him for a meaningful vocational experience. It is necessary here to stress that the institutionalized child has many different needs and goals that a well-adjusted child does not have. Often a project such as this would have to be continued for a long length of time in order to measure its value. This is true because of the type of child being dealt with and the many emotional ups and downs these children suffer that children from a normal, healthy home atmosphere do not experience.

Because of the tardiness in initiating the program at Family and Children's Center, much of the initial time was spent in the selection of materials and of children who were to participate in the program. At the onset, the participants given top priority were the above-named drop-outs with the objective being geared toward re-establishing one in the normal school system, and helping the other work toward a vocational school or the Armed services. The project expanded into a summer program using as a base

Green

those children who had been designated by their respective schools as being in need of remedial help during the summer to help them achieve the following year in school. In addition to these children pin-pointed by the school system as needing help, others were added who were evaluated by their respective caseworkers as being needful in terms of emotional maladjustments toward the academic situation and being poor achievers in school.

The project was built around two basic learning areas, reading and mathematics, with supplementary activities in phonics and grammar. The unique feature of the project in terms of academics was the handling of the students on a more or less individual basis which gave the instructor latitude in determining the students strengths and weaknesses in basic learning areas and developing a meaningful program for him as an individual. This feature was greatly enhanced by the subjective variable of the instructor's knowledge through case studies on each child and previewing by each child's case worker of the emotional maturity of the participants. In a program of this sort such knowledge is invaluable because it provides the instructor with an insight into the particular needs, which the class-room instructor in a regular school setting has no way of knowing. This individualized aspect also lent itself well to the partial elimination of competition with the participant's peer group. Such competition while in itself may be good, however, in the opinion of this writer, it must be de-emphasized with this type of youngster who often times in competition with peers has failed therefore creating a defeatist attitude. The taste of success, which comes in accomplishing a goal set within the participant's own limitations, is quite beneficial for it stimulates the possibility of success later on in the peer group.

III. What is the total number of children who are involved in your Title I program? Count a child only once regardless of how many programs he participates in.

The total number of children participating in the program - 19.

IV. (b) Have you coordinated your Title I program with other federally funded programs?

Program coordinated with Title I Reading Program in Mishawaka School System.

V. What effect has the Title I program had on the administrative structure of educational practice in your school system?

The program has had little effect on the structure of educational practice because of its confines to the institutionalized children at the Family and Children's Center.

VI. What evidence is there that the projects have been effective?

VII. Can you cite specific success stories; for example, a specific child or children who benefited from the project? Describe briefly. Names are not requested, but use the child's age or grade.

Since there was no standardized pre or post testing used in this program, it would be difficult to measure in objective terms the precise effectiveness of the program at Family and Children's Center. Teacher designed tests were used from time to time as a measure of the student's grasp of units taught. Also, in view of the newness of the program, and the flexibility which this very newness necessitated in the program, standardized testing as such would have been nearly impossible. Probably informal subjective analysis is more appropriate at this point, therefore it is possible to enumerate subjectively in terms of case studies some degree of success commensurate with the given participants emotional and academic ability. With the continuance of the program, more elaborate measurement is being provided for which will give more empirically the degree of success derived in the future. However, it should be stressed at this point, that empirical data alone could never suffice in reference to the type of child involved in this project in view of the emotional underdevelopment and/or in many cases low capability levels.

Below is a listing of some success stories stemming from the projects activities:

Case I Bob, a likeable ninth grader, age 16, who had "dropped out" of school by mutual agreement between himself and the school authorities was one of the participants in the program. Aside from his deep-seated feelings of inferiority in nearly all areas, Bob appeared to be of at least average ability and, with a lot of hard work, certainly capable of handling the school situation. His problem in school stemmed largely from lack of motivation together with a need of remedial work in basic areas of study. After spending three months in the program (3 hours a day), he was discontinued from the program in order that he might take advantage of a work opportunity at a local housing project near the Family and Children's Center grounds. Afterwards he began to express great interest in the possibility of returning to school and doing well. To date he has been re-enrolled in school and has maintained a remarkable attendance record for a boy who previously had been impossible to hold in school. Reportedly, he is making good progress and has a much improved attitude toward school itself. His caseworker believed this resulted from the encouragement and success of the Title I program at Family and Children's Center and reports to the Title I staff of Bob's stated intentions of failing no classes this year.

Case II John, 10 years of age, who had been in special education classes before placement in Family and Children's Center, was one of the most challenging cases in the Project. His ability level was estimated to be quite low, but the accuracy of the testing was dubious due to the distressed homelife from which he came. This in turn caused severe emotional disturbance within him. The caseworker expressed hope that John would be placed in a regular second grade class upon enrollment in September. The Title I staff expressed doubts that this could be accomplished. First because of John's past record as a behavior problem, secondly, his academic achievement which would not have placed him at first grade level at best. John did not enter the program until early in July which gave him two months in which to progress. His reaction to the Program at the Family and Children's Center was quite positive and by the end of the summer he was sounding out difficult words and handling first grade reading material with some success. John was tentatively placed in second grade in September and is reportedly doing quite well considering his background. His emotional adaptation to school life and participation with peer groups is on an upgrade and it would appear with additional help from the continuance of the program will anticipate further success in the future.

Case III Cindy, age 13, sixth grade pupil, and a poor achiever started the Project in June. Cindy, a girl with a multitude of emotional ups and downs, was recommended for the program in hopes that it would improve her basic attitude toward school. Her work in school was very inconsistent due to her emotional instability, although she was always able to come up with a fairly plausible excuse for not doing the work assigned to her. It was hoped that, with the individual attention she would receive in the Project, she would gain more confidence in her ability and at least develop a better adjustment to the academic environment. Her progress in the Project was marked with frequent crying spells and emotional frustration which made it difficult to judge to what degree the program helped her academically. However, her caseworker reports that her emotional adjustment to the new school term has remarkably improved.

VIII. Describe any training program involving both teachers and teacher aides. What was the total number of participants in each project? What was the general pattern or activity involved?

The training program for Title I staff at Family and Children's Center was informal. It included visits to the schools to see their remedial programs in action and conferences with the reading consultant in Mishawaka School System. One teacher participated in the program.